

INTER OFFICE MEMO



C. L. Knowles

AT

DATE June 1, 1983

P. B. Duff

AT

COPY TO B. E. Hill
A. M. Carnam

LEAD ANALYSIS PINE SWAMP

Connecticut DEP officials have expressed concern relative to elevated lead concentrations in samples obtained by department personnel on December 11 and 15, 1981 from groundwater monitoring wells located at Pine Swamp. Results of this analysis were shared with Olin in early August 1982, and this information was inconsistent with results obtained by ERT during their Phase II study program. At my request, Ted Groom (Olin-New Haven) recently resampled the three wells involved and listed below is a synopsis of all data described above.

LOCATION INFORMATION		12/10 ^t 12/15 DEP SAMPLE		OLIN/ERT DECEMBER 1981 PHASE II SAMPLE		MAY '83 OLIN RESAMPLE	
		ppb		ppb		ppb	
		VALUE	DETECTION LIMIT	VALUE	DETECTION LIMIT	VALUE	DETECTION LIMIT
WELL NUMBER	WELL DEPTH						
ERT 9	5'	300	?	ND	100	7.5	7.5
ERT 17	7.5'	940	?	180	100	132	7.5
ERT 20	15'	280	?	ND	100	24	7.5

ERT's initial sample was analyzed on a flame-type atomic adsorption unit that has a detection limit of 100 ppb. Drinking water quality analysis should be conducted on a flameless graphite furnace, therefore, Ted Groom resampled each well and supervised the reanalysis on an appropriate unit that has a 7.5 ppb detection limit.

NOTE: Drinking water standard for lead is 50 ppb.

Olin's reanalysis shows that water withdrawn from ERT 9 and 20 is well within the drinking water limit for lead, while ERT 17 shows a moderate elevation.

These latest results illustrated that lead contained in battery waste buried at Pine Swamp is quite immobile and doesn't transfer readily to the adjacent groundwater.

P. B. Duff
P. B. Duff

PBD/sp



SEMS DocID 624167

INTER OFFICE MEMO

Pine Swamp

TO P. B. Duff AT Stamford DATE June 3, 1983
 FROM T. Groom New Haven
 J. D. Kaufman AT New Haven COPY TO W. W. Harple
 R. N. Scott
 SUBJECT PINE SWAMP SAMPLES FOR LEAD File #22

On May 19, 1983, 3 monitoring wells at Pine Swamp were sampled and analyzed for lead. Results are listed below. The limit of detection of the method used was <7.5 ppb.

ERT Well #9	7.5 ppb; 7.5 ppb
ERT Well #17	135 ppb; 130 ppb
ERT Well #20	35 ppb; 12 ppb


Experimental:

The wells were sampled with an ISCO peristaltic pump using teflon tubing rinsed with distilled, deionized water between samples. All wells were 2" PVC pipe.

Site	Well Volume	Volume Pumped Before Sampling
Well #9	6 1/4 liters	21 liters
Well #17	7.5 liters	42 liters
Well #20	9.3 liters	51 liters

Each well was pumped for ~5 well volumes before taking a 1 gallon sample. Well #9 went dry after ~20 liters (3.4 well volumes) and recovered only very slowly. A sample was then taken after ~1/2 hr. wait. There appeared to be an obstruction at ~6 1/2 feet in this well. After many attempts the sampling tube would go no lower.

All samples were pressure filtered through a 0.8 μ m millipore filter before analysis for lead.


 T. Groom


 J. D. Kaufman

mdw

Ref.: B50815-B
 B50815-A
 B50815-C

RECEIVED

JUN 7 1983

P. B. DUFF

INTER OFFICE MEMO



TO C. L. Knowles
FROM P. B. Duff
SUBJECT PINE SWAMP

AT Stamford
AT Stamford

DATE August 17, 1982
COPY TO T. Groom


Attached is a copy of the states analysis conducted on groundwater with-
drawn from the following wells:

ERT 9
ERT 17
ERT 20

Brian Curtis noted that samples #9 and #17 contained a small amount of brown
floc.

ERT reported non detected for the lead while the states results are as
follows:

<u>Well No.</u>	<u>Lead ppb</u>
ERT 9	300
ERT 17	940
ERT 20	280


P. B. Duff

PBD/mao

Attachment

ATTACHMENT G